

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, the claims have been amended for clarity.

Applicants believe that the above changes answer the Examiner's objection to claim 57, and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

The Examiner has rejected claims 66 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has allowed claims 42-58 and 58-65, and has found claim 57 allowable over the prior art of record.

With regard to claims 66 and 67, Applicants believe that the Examiner is mistaken. While ordinarily, a record carrier comprising a composite information signal per se is not statutory, Applicant submits that claims 66 and 67 fall into the exception as outlined in the *Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions*, Final Version, in which, in paragraph IV(B)(2)(i), Statutory Subject Matter is defined as "Claims that Encompass Any Machine or Manufacture Embodiment of a Process". It should be clear that claim 66 embodies a product (i.e., a record carrier containing a composite information signal) produced by the process as claimed in claim 42. Correspondingly, claim 67 embodies a product (i.e., a record carrier containing a composite information signal) produced by the process as claimed in claim 43.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 66 and 67 are indeed statutory and should be allowed along with their corresponding process claims 42 and 43.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 42-67, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611